



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,089	02/07/2006	Sawako Nakamura	58922US005	2391
32692	7590	08/26/2009	EXAMINER	
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY			DESAI, ANISH P	
PO BOX 33427				
ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/26/2009	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

LegalUSDocketing@mmm.com  
LegalDocketing@mmm.com

1. **Continuation of Box 5:**

2. The 35 USC Section 103(a) rejections based on Masaki et al. (JP 10-077308) in view of Akihiro et al. (JP H2000-230162A1) to claims 11 and 26 are moot, because these claims are cancelled.

3. **Continuation of Box 11:**

4. Applicant's arguments as set forth on pages 7-9 of 08/07/09 amendment are not found persuasive for the following reasons:

(A) The Examiner submits that applicant's arguments relating to the multilayer adhesive ***with no metal hydrate in the outer/exposed surface*** (i.e. second PSA layer being the outermost layer) are not found persuasive, because presently claimed invention does not require that the second PSA layer is the outermost layer or the exposed layer.

(B) With respect to applicant's showing of data in the specification (Table 1) in order to support applicant's position that the presence of metal hydrate would materially change the characteristics of the invention and therefore fall outside the scope of "consisting essentially of" claim language, the Examiner submits that the data pointed to by applicant is not persuasive given that applicant has not made proper side-by-side comparison of samples (i.e. sample 1 and sample 2 each containing PSA with same types and amounts of monomers, but one of the samples does not contain metal hydrate). For example, applicant's Example 2 and Comparative Example 2 both have different monomers. Specifically outer

layer of Example 2 contains isooctyl acrylate and acrylic acid, whereas the Comparative Example 2 contains n-butylacrylamide, acrylic acid, Irgacure 651, and metal hydrate. Therefore, it is not clear whether the metal hydrate is responsible for change in the adhesion characteristics of applicant's invention. Similar is true for Comparative Example 1 and Example 4. Accordingly, applicant's arguments are not found persuasive.

/A. D./

Examiner, Art Unit 1794

/Callie E. Shosho/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794